12:Emeneau L-5 (1935-1938)1941 AW60 Toda AW60

emotional attitude of the Todas towards their matrilineal sib-system is presented. It is thought that in this use of song material the "amateurish" methodology against which Sapir protested has been avoided, and some light has been thrown upon Toda institutions in a way which he would have approved. The study ends with some discussion of the bearing of the Todas' dual descent system on the historical question of their "origin," which has engaged the attention of most of those who have studied them.

Rivers' account of the kinship system of the Todas is essentially correct.[2] Linguistic research with this tribe has added little but detail to our knowledge of this department of the tribal institutions, except in the important matter of dual descent, which escaped Rivers' meticulous investigations.[3] In this paper I shall present the kinship terms in correct linguistic shape, and shall make the few factual corrections that are necessary. The main body of the paper will be devoted to a discussion of the dual descent system.

The most important factual correction in Rivers' account relates to the age distinctions made in the kinship system. He records three age-groups in EGO's generation based on age relative to that of EGO.[4] In fact, the system makes only two distinctions. There is a dichotomy on the basis of age relative to EGO. An elder brother or male parallel cousin in either patrilineal or matrilineal sib or outside them (son of EGO's mother's clan-sister) is oṇ in reference, oṇaı in address; an elder sister or female parallel cousin related in the same ways is okn in reference, oknı in address. A younger sibling or parallel cousin related in the same ways, without distinction of sex, is -ɵɯɾ-fed in reference, with the appropriate pronominal form preceding, and endaı in address. En-ɵɯɾ-fed is "my younger sibling," literally "one who was born with, or after, me;" num-ɵɯɾ-fed "your younger sibling," an-ɵɯɾ-fed (or an-dan-ɵɯɾ-fed) "his or her younger sibling," om-ɵɯɾ-fed "our (inclusive) younger sibling," em-ɵɯɾ-fed "our (exclusive) younger sibling," nɯm-ɵɯɾ-fed "your (plural) younger sibling;" "their younger sibling" is the same as "his or her" or oɓɯm-ɵɯɾ-fed. If the sex of the person referred to must be indicated, -mox added to any of the forms signifies a male, -xuıx (=kuıx) a female.[5]

[2] W. H. R. Rivers, *The Todas* (London, 1906), pp. 483–501 for the kinship terms. The volume is referred to in this paper as Rivers. In mentioning members of the tribe by name a number is frequently added in brackets after the name; this refers to the corresponding genealogical table in Rivers.

[3] See M. B. Emeneau, *Toda Marriage Regulations and Taboos* (American Anthropologist, Vol. 39, pp. 103–22, 1937) for a detailed account of the matrilineal sibs which are found within the moieties and cut across the well-known division into patrilineal sibs. In the present paper I employ the same system of phonemic writing that was used in that paper, with the corrections made in my later paper *Personal Names of the Todas* (American Anthropologist, Vol. 40, pp. 205–23, 1938), p. 205 fn. 1. In this paper I use š, ž for palatalized alveolar sibilants, č, ǰ for post-dental affricates and č̣, ǰ̣ for palatalized post-dental affricates; ɯ is a high, back, unrounded vowel. Acknowledgments are due again to the American Council of Learned Societies for aid in my field-work in 1935–36 and to the American Philosophical Society (Penrose Fund) for aid in 1936–38.

[4] Pp. 486 bottom, 487, and passim.

[5] Rivers, p. 487, said: "I do not know whether the children of two women of the same generation in [a patrilineal sib] would call one another brother and sister." The terms are extended to all children of women whom one would refer to as mother, whether they are in his patrilineal or matrilineal sib, or outside them. The term

12: Emeneau L-5 (1935-1938)1941 AW60 Toda AW60

601 561 114 [576] Besides these Rivers distinguished a relative of this type who is of the same age as EGO. This distinction is in fact impossible, both in the strict temporal sense, and in the Toda cultural pattern. It is always known how the persons in question stand to one another in the matter of relative time of birth, and in such cultural contexts as formal greetings[5] no room is left by the pattern for a class of the same age as EGO. For example, at a gathering each new male arrival must salute all the males already present with the proper formal term of address, and among these all classificatory elder brothers must be greeted. If any of those present is neglected, the offender is reprimanded and if necessary fined for the neglect. The pattern in its strict application makes a clean dichotomy and in practically all circumstances the dichotomy is rigidly enforced. The word given by Rivers for his third class is koɨ "friend," occurring chiefly with pronominal forms preceding, egoɨ or en-goɨ "my friend" (in address -es is added), nun-goɨ "your friend," an-goɨ or tan-goɨ "his or her friend," etc. These terms are normally used between or with reference to close friends of the same age-level who are not related to one another (e.g., typically between two persons who belong to different moieties). They may also be used where formality is not enforced by the pattern; I have no certain information as to whether they could be used between siblings, but there is some slight evidence to be discussed below which would indicate that it is possible. It is to be noted however that this is only permissive and that the term does not designate any kinship class or even any relationship that is highly formalized in the culture.[7]

533 601 [193] When two persons sing together, certain subjects allow or require that vocatives be used at the beginning, the end, and important division-points of the songs. In most of the texts that I have recorded the proper kinship terms are used in such songs. Ten songs use the conventional song-words for "friend (vocative)," enbocxoɨjɑ1, eningoɨjɑ1.[8] Three situations may be divided off. In the first (three songs) the two singers are of different moieties and presumably no "lover-mistress" relationship would require kinship terms.[9] In a second class (four songs) membership of the same moiety might very well involve a relationship where kinship terms should be used, but I do not know of any such relationship; two of the songs were sung by the same pair of singers and were dictated to me at a sufficient interval of time so that the use of "friend" terms is guaranteed. In a third class (three songs) there was certainly relationship between the singers, but as dictated the "friend" terms were used. These songs were dictated rather early in my field-work before I realized all the implications of the

[114] [126] [601] [561]

---

in address is the simple vocative (distinguished by sex and relative age); in reference the simple brother-sister terms might be used or, where more exact reference is necessary, descriptive terms. In the case of address to cross-cousins of the same sex as EGO the brother-sister terms are used (see note 7 below).

[5] Rivers, pp. 496–98.

[7] In the case also of address to cross-cousins of the same sex as the speaker there is no room for Rivers' third classification (p. 488 bottom); only age older or younger than that of EGO is taken into account in determining the kinship term to be used.

[114] [8] For the nature of the song-words, see my paper *The Songs of the Todas* (Proceedings, American Philosophical Society, Vol. 77, pp. 543–60, 1937), especially pp. 549–59.

[9] For this relationship, see Rivers, pp. 526–29.

12:Emeneau L-5 (1935-1938)1941 AW60 Toda AW60

song-language, and it is possible that the informants, who happened to be in no case the singers, dictated incorrectly. In one song *piljɑɪr* (Piliar, 32) and *merɳuus* (Mudriners, 37) sang; these men were of the same patrilineal sib and used "brother" terms to one another. In another *sindɯrp* (Sintharap), wife of *kɯɯɪsjuff* (Kuriolv, 32), and *koɪsor* (Kosar, 37) sang; these women would certainly have used "sister" terms to one another. In the third song, which was dreamed, two men recently dead were singing: *tæɾθjxæm*, son of *sirjɑɪr* (Siriar, 20), and *tɒɒθɯɪ*, son of *toɪkɑs* (Tokas) and *pɯnuɪr* (Puner, 23); they belonged to the same patrilineal sib and the former called the latter *ejɑɪ* "father." Other dreamed songs in which dead persons sang used the correct kinship terms. It is difficult to interpret this small minority of songs in which relationship was neglected. It may be possible that relationship can be neglected; I prefer to suspect mistakes in the record until further field work can clear the matter up.

The kinship system is of the type known as the Dakota-Iroquois system (see accompanying diagrams and Appendix). The salient points of the system are those stressed by Rivers—the obligatory indication of age-distinctions in ɐoo's generation (with the qualification made in the preceding discussion) and the permissive indication in the first ascending generation (see p. 163 below); the obligatory distinction in the first ascending generation between father's brothers and male parallel cousins and mother's sisters and female parallel cousins on the one hand, and father's sisters and female parallel cousins and mother's brothers and male parallel cousins on the other, and in ɐoo's generation between the children of these two groups. A clear distinction is made between terms used in reference and those used in address. The reference terms are built about a core of simplex classificatory terms with a large number of phrasal and frequently *ad hoc* terms to indicate those to whom the simplex terms do not apply. Permissively, the simplex terms also may be replaced by phrasal terms when very exact reference is needed, e.g., *mon-mox* "son of sibling of sex opposed to that of ɐoo" (itself phrasal, but in connotation a simplex) and *mon-gutɪ* "daughter, etc." may be replaced by *en-okng-fæɪdfoj-mox* "son who was born to my elder sister (male speaking)," *en-ɑɯr-fed-mosk-fæɪdfoj-xutɪ* "daughter who was born to my younger brother (female speaking)," etc. The terms of address, on the other hand, are all simplex classificatory terms and, being extended very widely, neglect a number of the reference classifications, indicated either by simplex or by phrasal terms. A summary of the system follows:

There is no self-reciprocating terminology in address. In reference *moʧiŋj* "cross-cousin" is self-reciprocating, since it does not distinguish sex or relative age; when a permissively added word indicates the sex, the self-reciprocating nature of the term is destroyed. In ɐoo's generation his siblings and classificatory parallel cousins are referred to and addressed by terms which distinguish age older than himself and younger than himself respectively and sex is distinguished in the case of those older than himself.

Sex is specified in referring to and addressing members of the ascending generations, except in referring to the cross-cousins of one's parents and of one's parents' siblings and parallel cousins (*en-in-moʧiŋj* "my father's cross-cousin," *en-af-moʧiŋj* "my mother's cross-